

KEVIN P. ALLEN, State Bar No. 252290  
[kallen@aghwlaw.com](mailto:kallen@aghwlaw.com)  
 ALLEN, GLAESSNER, HAZELWOOD & WERTH, LLP  
 180 Montgomery Street, Suite 1200  
 San Francisco, CA 94104  
 Telephone: (415) 697-2000  
 Facsimile: (415) 813-2045

Attorneys for Defendants  
 CITY OF SUNNYVALE and OFFICER JOHN  
 BOGNANNO

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOHN DOE,

Plaintiff,

v.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE OF THE  
 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,

Defendants.

Superior Court of Santa Clara Case No.  
 22CV405055

**REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE IN  
 SUPPORT OF NOTICE OF REMOVAL OF  
 ACTION UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1441 (FEDERAL  
 QUESTION); DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 201, defendants CITY OF SUNNYVALE and  
 OFFICER JOHN BOGNANNO by and through its attorneys, request the Court take judicial  
 notice of the following:

1. Attached as Exhibit “A,” please find a true and correct copy of the complaint filed  
 in the Superior Court of the State of California, in and for the County of Santa Clara, entitled  
*John Doe vs. Department of Justice of the State of California, et al.*, case number 22CV405055.

2. Attached as Exhibit “B,” please find a true and correct copy of all process,  
 pleadings, and orders served on Defendant in Santa Clara Superior Court case number  
 22CV405055, that are not already identified in Ex. “A.”

The court may review “materials of which the court may take judicial notice,” *Barron v.*  
*Reich*, 13 F.3d 1370, 1377 (9th Cir.1994), including public records and “proceedings in other  
 courts, both within and without the federal judicial system, if those proceedings have a direct

1 relation to matters at issue.” *Bias v. Moynihan*, 508 F.3d 1212, 1225 (9th Cir. Nov.2007) (quoting  
2 *Bennett v. Medtronic, Inc.*, 285 F.3d 801, 803 n. 2 (9th Cir.2002).

3  
4  
5 Dated: December 13, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

ALLEN, GLAESSNER,  
HAZELWOOD & WERTH, LLP

6  
7  
8 By: /s/ Kevin P. Allen  
KEVIN P. ALLEN  
Attorneys for Defendants  
CITY OF SUNNYVALE and OFFICER JOHN  
BOGNANNO

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
ALLEN, GLAESSNER, HAZELWOOD & WERTH, LLP  
180 Montgomery Street, Suite 1200  
San Francisco, California 94104

**EXHIBIT “A”**

# SUMMONS (CITACION JUDICIAL)

NOV 14 2022

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE  
CITY OF SUNNYVALE

SUM-100

FOR COURT USE ONLY  
(SOLO PARA USO DE LA CORTE)

E-FILED

9/30/2022 4:35 PM

Clerk of Court  
Superior Court of CA,  
County of Santa Clara  
22CV405055Reviewed By: A. Tam  
Envelope: 10107221

## NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: (AVISO AL DEMANDADO):

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  
CITY OF SUNNYVALE, OFFICER JOHN BOGNANNO, and DOES 1 to 50,

## YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF:

(LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE):

JOHN DOE

NOTICE! You have been sued. The court may decide against you without your being heard unless you respond within 30 days. Read the information below.

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center ([www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp](http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp)), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site ([www.lawhelpcalifornia.org](http://www.lawhelpcalifornia.org)), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center ([www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp](http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp)), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. **NOTE:** The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case. **¡AVISO! Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su versión. Lea la información a continuación.**

Tiene 30 DÍAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no lo protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted pueda usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California ([www.sucorte.ca.gov](http://www.sucorte.ca.gov)), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede más cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida al secretario de la corte que le dé un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin más advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de remisión a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, ([www.lawhelpcalifornia.org](http://www.lawhelpcalifornia.org)), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, ([www.sucorte.ca.gov](http://www.sucorte.ca.gov)) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. **AVISO:** Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos por imponer un gravamen sobre cualquier recuperación de \$10,000 ó más de valor recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesión de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corte antes de que la corte pueda desechar el caso.

The name and address of the court is:

(El nombre y dirección de la corte es): Santa Clara County Superior Court

191 N. First St., San Jose, CA 95113

CASE NUMBER:  
(Número del Caso):

22CV405055

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is:

(El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):

Michael Millen, Esq., 119 Calle Marguerita #100, Los Gatos, CA 95032; tel. (408) 871-2777; MikeMillen@aol.com

DATE:

(Fecha) 9/30/2022 4:35 PM

Clerk of Court

Clerk, by

(Secretario)

A. Tam

, Deputy

(Adjunto)

(For proof of service of this summons, use Proof of Service of Summons (form POS-010).)

(Para prueba de entrega de esta citación use el formulario Proof of Service of Summons, (POS-010)).

[SEAL]



## NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served

- ☐ as an individual defendant.
- ☐ as the person sued under the fictitious name of (specify):
- ☒ on behalf of (specify): City of Sunnyvale  
 under: ☒ CCP 416.10 (corporation) ☐ CCP 416.60 (minor)  
☐ CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation) ☐ CCP 416.70 (conservatee)  
☐ CCP 416.40 (association or partnership) ☐ CCP 416.90 (authorized person)  
☐ other (specify):
- ☒ by personal delivery on (date): 11/14/2022

Page 1 of 1



E-FILED  
9/30/2022 4:35 PM  
Clerk of Court  
Superior Court of CA,  
County of Santa Clara  
22CV405055  
Reviewed By: A. Tam

Michael Millen  
Attorney at Law (#151731)  
119 Calle Marguerita Ste. 100  
Los Gatos, CA 95032  
Telephone: (408) 871-2777  
Fax: (408) 866-7480  
[mikemillen@aol.com](mailto:mikemillen@aol.com)

Attorney for Plaintiff

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA

JOHN DOE,

Plaintiff,

v.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE OF THE STATE  
OF CALIFORNIA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  
CITY OF SUNNYVALE, OFFICER JOHN  
BOGNANNO, and DOES 1 to 50,

Defendants.

NO.: 22CV405055

(Limited Civil Case – Over \$10,000)

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL RIGHTS  
VIOLATION**

1. 42 U.S.C. § 1983
2. False Arrest
3. Negligence
4. Information Practices Act – Civil Code §1798 et seq

Plaintiff alleges as follows:

1. Plaintiff John Doe is a resident of the County of Santa Clara, California. Because of the nature of the allegations herein, plaintiff is identified by a pseudonym in order to preserve confidentiality and to avoid any potential opprobrium, pursuant to applicable law, including *Starbucks Corp. v. Superior Ct.* (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 1436.

2. Defendant State of California is a constituent state in the United States of America and has as one of its departments the Department of Justice.

3. The City of Sunnyvale is a municipal corporation in the State of California. The City of Sunnyvale has, as one of its constituent parts, a Department of Public Safety which, among other things, provides police services.

1 4. At all times relevant to this complaint, John Bognanno was a sworn officer employed by  
2 the City of Sunnyvale in its Department of Public Safety.

3 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that each of the fictitiously  
4 named defendants were in some manner legally responsible for the unlawful actions, unlawful  
5 policies, and unlawful practices alleged in this complaint. Plaintiff will amend the Complaint to set  
6 forth the true names and capacities of said defendants, along with the appropriate charging  
7 allegations, when the same have been ascertained.

8 6. Venue is proper in this county because Plaintiff was wrongfully arrested and wrongfully  
9 jailed in this county.

#### 10 **ALLEGATIONS CONCERNING PLAINTIFF**

11 7. In October 2005, Plaintiff was convicted (via plea) of a misdemeanor violation of  
12 California Penal Code §314.1 (indecent exposure) in a Santa Clara County Superior Court criminal  
13 case. For the years 2005 through 2020 Plaintiff registered as per Penal Code §290 et seq. at the  
14 Sunnyvale Police Department.

15 8. On March 17, 2021, the Santa Clara County Superior Court entered an order vacating  
16 the judgment of conviction in said criminal case and dismissing the charges. Because Plaintiff was  
17 no longer a person who had been convicted of an offense requiring registration under Penal Code  
18 §290 et seq., Plaintiff had no ongoing legal duty to annually register at the police department.

19 9. In or about June 2021 Plaintiff was concerned that Plaintiff's criminal history record at  
20 the California Department of Justice ("DOJ") was incorrect and erroneously continued to show a  
21 conviction in said criminal case despite the fact that said conviction had now been vacated.  
22 Plaintiff wrote a letter to the DOJ informing them that the criminal conviction had been vacated  
23 and included a paper copy of the March 17, 2021, court order.

24 10. On or about July 2, 2021, the DOJ, in writing, acknowledged receipt of Plaintiff's June  
25 2021 letter and stated that "Modification or deletion of this information can only occur at the  
26 direction of the contributing agency or by order of the court having jurisdiction over the criminal  
27 matter. As such, please be advised your claim of alleged inaccuracy or incompleteness is in  
28

1 process.” A copy of the letter is attached as Exhibit A (with noted redactions for privacy). Plaintiff  
2 received no further communication from the DOJ regarding the matter.

3 11. In or about October 2021, Plaintiff took a paper copy of the March 17, 2021, Order and  
4 gave it to an officer at the Sunnyvale Police Department. Plaintiff explained to the officer on duty  
5 that Plaintiff was no longer required to register. During this brief meeting, the officer did not  
6 object or otherwise dispute Plaintiff’s explanation of the situation nor did the officer suggest that  
7 Plaintiff did in fact have a continuing duty to register.

8 12. On or about January 9, 2022, Plaintiff went to the Sunnyvale Police Department to  
9 obtain a police report related to a recent traffic incident. To Plaintiff’s great shock, Plaintiff was  
10 arrested and put into jail on the charge of violation of Penal Code §290/§290.012 (failure to  
11 register). Plaintiff is informed and believes that the police officer who arrested Plaintiff was John  
12 Bognanno. Plaintiff was released many hours later that same day. To obtain release from jail,  
13 Plaintiff had to sign a promise to appear at court. Plaintiff honored the commitment to appear and  
14 in doing so missed work in the process, causing financial loss. Plaintiff is informed and believes  
15 and thereon alleges that this Penal Code §290/§290.012 charge against Plaintiff was dismissed and  
16 no further proceedings occurred.

17 13. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Plaintiff was arrested by the  
18 Sunnyvale Police partly, if not wholly, because the DOJ failed to promptly correct DOJ records  
19 concerning Plaintiff after receiving credible information that the DOJ records were now incorrect,  
20 and the unlawful practice of the Sunnyvale Police is to rely substantially (if not exclusively) on  
21 DOJ records in determining whether a person has as duty to register as per Penal Code §290 et seq.  
22 even if the police are presented with contrary information suggesting the DOJ records are incorrect.  
23 It is also unclear as to whether the Santa Clara County Superior Court did or did not promptly  
24 notify the DOJ of the March 17, 2021, reversal of Plaintiff’s conviction and subsequent dismissal.  
25 If it did not then it, too, shares responsibility as well for Plaintiff’s harm.  
26  
27  
28



1 **ALLEGATIONS CONCERNING TORT CLAIMS COMPLIANCE**

2 14. In regard to the State of California, plaintiff has complied with the California Govt.  
3 Tort Claims Act. Plaintiff, through counsel, filed a Claim regarding these matters with the Cal.  
4 Dept. of General Services which noted the claim as being as received on April 8, 2022. Plaintiff,  
5 through counsel, filed an Amended Claim with the same department which was noted as being  
6 received on June 17, 2022. Plaintiff has not received any formal response from the State Dept. of  
7 General Services accepting or denying either the original Claim or the Amended Claim. Over 45  
8 days have elapsed since said claims were submitted.

9 15. Also in regard to the State of California, plaintiff, through counsel, filed a Claim  
10 regarding these matters with the Judicial Branch on May 24, 2022, by presenting said claim to the  
11 Santa Clara County Superior Court. The Judicial Council of California rejected this claim on June  
12 27, 2022.

13 16. In regard to the City of Sunnyvale, plaintiff filed a claim with the City regarding these  
14 matters on March 2, 2022. Plaintiff, through counsel, filed an Amended Claim on April 11, 2022.  
15 On May 6, 2022, the City of Sunnyvale gave formal notice that both claims were rejected in their  
16 entirety.

17 **ALLEGATIONS CONCERNING**

18 **CRIMINAL OFFENDER RECORD INFORMATION**

19 17. The DOJ is composed of various constituent parts, with one such part being called the  
20 "California Justice Information Services Division" ("CJIS") which professes as its mission the  
21 responsibility "to provide accurate, timely, and comprehensive criminal history and analysis data to  
22 its client agencies, which include California's local police and sheriff's departments, district  
23 attorneys, and local and state regulatory agencies." (<https://oag.ca.gov/careers/descriptions/cjis>).

24 18. The data kept by the CJIS is specifically defined in 22 Cal. Code of Regulations  
25 §100343.1 as follows:

26 "Criminal Offender Record Information" or "CORI" means records and data  
27 compiled by criminal justice agencies for purposes of identifying criminal offenders  
28 and of maintaining as to each such offender a summary of arrests, pretrial



proceedings, the nature and disposition of criminal charges, sentencing, incarceration, rehabilitation, and release.

### *IMPORTANCE OF CORRECT CORI RECORDS*

19. The DOJ's CORI records are used in wide variety of settings which fundamentally affect the ability of California residents to function in society. District Attorneys use CORI when they charge criminal enhancements and also when making charging decisions for criminal suspects based in part upon whether the suspect's CORI shows a checkered past. Police use CORI to determine whether a subject has violated a registration requirement (such as wrongly happened with Plaintiff) and as a guide in investigating and questioning "likely suspects". Judges use CORI to determine the severity of sentencing for apparent repeat offenders while state licensing bureau administrators use CORI to determine whether an applicant is eligible for a license. Employers may rescind job offers and landlords may deny housing to those whose CORI shows convictions. In short, outdated or incorrect CORI can completely deny citizens the ability to effectively work or live in California.

### *FAILURE TO MAINTAIN ACCURATE CORI RECORDS*

#### *AND INSTITUTE REASONABLE PROCESSES FOR CORRECTIONS*

20. The California Legislature has recognized the importance of accurate CORI and in Penal Code §11126 has set forth a detailed procedure for the DOJ to follow when someone (deemed an "applicant") requests that their CORI record be corrected. Once the DOJ agrees that the record is incorrect based upon the applicant's provided source material, the DOJ has 30 days to inform the applicant of the correction. If the DOJ questions the applicant's source material it may request that the outside agency clarify the record and respond within 30 days. Once the DOJ refuses to alter the record it must notify the applicant within 30 days and offer him or her the right to an administrative adjudication.

21. As comprehensive as this remedial CORI corrective scheme may appear, there are several glaring omissions in these timelines such that there is no mention of:

1 A) The length of time the DOJ has to begin, and then complete, its initial review of the  
2 record review request and submitted material;

3 B) The length of time the DOJ has to make its final decision if records are not needed  
4 from an outside agency;

5 C) The length of time the DOJ has to request that an outside agency clarify the record  
6 and then process the outside agency's response and give a final decision.

7 22. The DOJ has neither allocated sufficient staff nor appropriate processes and policies to  
8 carry out, in a reasonably timely fashion, its duty to maintain accurate CORI and to correct  
9 inaccurate CORI. It is well aware of the unacceptable backlog times CJIS has in regards to  
10 correcting clearly erroneous records and the harm that these incorrect records cause the public.

11 23. The DOJ's unacceptable handling time was amply demonstrated by the fact that the  
12 DOJ, after being presented with a copy of a court order showing Plaintiff's conviction having been  
13 reversed and the case dismissed, did not correct Plaintiff's CORI even after the elapse of seven  
14 months. Given that the court order could have been verified as authentic by contacting the court  
15 itself or the Deputy District Attorney who handled the matter (and whose email and phone contact  
16 information was listed on the order), there was no legitimate reason for Plaintiff's CORI to remain  
17 inaccurate for so long apart from lack of training, understaffing and/or unworkable bureaucratic  
18 regulations and rules.

19 24. An obvious partial-solution to this problem would be to spend additional funds hiring  
20 CJIS staff to clear the backlog. Assuming that the fully burdened cost of a document verification  
21 clerk is \$125,000 per year, CJIS could hire 80 clerks for \$10 million. However, in the 2020-2021  
22 budget, the governor *reduced* the CJIS budget by \$10 million and instead shifted the \$10 million to  
23 the Bureau of Forensic Services (which provides DNA testing and on-site crime scene support).  
24 (See 2020-2021 DOJ budget Analysis, [https://lao.ca.gov/handouts/crimjust/2021/DOJ-Budget-](https://lao.ca.gov/handouts/crimjust/2021/DOJ-Budget-021021.pdf)  
25 [021021.pdf](https://lao.ca.gov/handouts/crimjust/2021/DOJ-Budget-021021.pdf), p. 3).  
26  
27  
28

**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(VIOLATION OF 42 U.S.C. §1983)**

**(As Against City of Sunnyvale and Officer John Bognanno Only)**

25. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as if fully restated here.

26. The City of Sunnyvale and its police officers knew or should have known that Plaintiff was no longer required to register under Penal Code §290 et seq. once they were presented with the court order which vacated that conviction.

27. The unlawful seizure, arrest, and other actions and inactions of the defendants and their employees, representatives and agents constitute either intentional conduct and/or grossly negligent violations of the right to be free from unjust, arbitrary, unreasonable and capricious governmental action which violates the constitutional rights of the Plaintiff secured by the First, Fourth, Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution and 42 U.S.C. §1983.

28. The City of Sunnyvale failed to issue policies and supervise and train its enforcement officers to adequately document in the file and research the legal necessity of continuing §290 registration for residents whom the City had reason to believe may have been relieved of registration requirements.

29. Plaintiff suffered damage and is entitled to compensation therefore.

**SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

**State Law (False Arrest and False Imprisonment)**

**(As Against All Defendants)**

30. Plaintiff incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 to 24 as if fully restated here.

31. Plaintiff had previously provided documentary proof to both the Sunnyvale Police Department and the DOJ that, as of March 17, 2021, there was no lawful conviction against plaintiff for violation of any law requiring registration pursuant to Penal Code §290 et seq.



1 32. Nevertheless, the Sunnyvale Police Department falsely arrested and imprisoned  
 2 plaintiff, and plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that this was done partially or  
 3 wholly based upon incorrect information provided by the DOJ.

4 33. Plaintiff suffered damage and is entitled to compensation therefore.

### 5 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### 6 **State Law (Negligence)**

#### 7 **(As Against All Defendants)**

8 34. Plaintiff incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 to 24 as if fully restated here.

9 35. All Defendants had a legal responsibility for the receipt, retention, management,  
 10 correction, release, and usage of their records.

11 36. Defendants breached those these duties in numerous ways including, but not limited, to  
 12 the following: (a) keeping inaccurate records in their files concerning Plaintiff's criminal history  
 13 and P.C. §290 registration requirements when Defendants knew or should have known that the  
 14 records were inaccurate; (b) failing to implement policies and procedures to timely follow up on in  
 15 information which, on its face, showed that their records were incorrect; (c) failing to hire, train,  
 16 and monitor sufficient staff to ensure that inaccurate or changed records were corrected in a  
 17 reasonable amount of time; (d) immediately upon receipt of information which, on its face, showed  
 18 that Defendants' records concerning plaintiff were incorrect, to place some sort of note or flag on  
 19 the file which would clearly communicate to the receiver of those records that the accuracy of the  
 20 record was in question and should not be relied upon without independent verification; (e) delaying  
 21 in transmitting correct information to any state or local agency for whom a Defendant was  
 22 responsible to so transmit.

23 37. Plaintiff suffered damage caused by Defendants' breaches and is entitled to  
 24 compensation therefore.



**FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**State Law (Information Practices Act – Civil Code §1798 et seq.)**

**(As Against The State of California)**

38. Plaintiff incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 to 24 as if fully restated here.

39. Under Civil Code §1798.18, all departments of the State of California have a duty to “maintain all records, to the maximum extent possible, with accuracy, relevance, timeliness, and completeness” and, when transferring someone’s record outside of state government, “shall correct, update, withhold, or delete any portion of the record that it knows or has reason to believe is inaccurate or untimely.”

40. The DOJ and the State of California (of which the DOJ is a constituent part) is liable under Govt. Code §815.6 for its failure to comply with Civil Code §1798.18.

41. Under Civil Code §1798.45(b), plaintiff may bring a civil action against the DOJ and the State for its failure to maintain its records concerning plaintiff with accuracy, relevancy, timeliness, and completeness because, as a proximate result of such failure, plaintiff was incorrectly and adversely determined to have a duty to register under Penal Code §290 et seq. and by consequence wrongfully arrested.

42. Plaintiff suffered damage caused by the Defendants’ breach of this statutory duty and is entitled to compensation therefore.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that this Court:

**ON THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:**

1. Award general and special damages to plaintiff;
2. Award costs, interest and attorneys’ fees to plaintiff pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §1988 and other pertinent federal law;
3. Grant such other and further relief as the court deems just and proper.

**ON THE SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION:**

1. Award general and special damages to plaintiff;
2. Award costs to plaintiff;
3. Grant such other and further relief as the court deems just and proper.

**ON THE THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION:**

1. Award general and special damages to plaintiff;
2. Award costs to plaintiff;
3. Grant such other and further relief as the court deems just and proper.

**ON THE FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION:**

1. Award general and special damages to plaintiff including those available under Civil Code §1798.48(a);
2. Award costs and attorney's fees to plaintiff pursuant to Civil Code §1798.48(b);
3. Grant such other and further relief as the court deems just and proper.

Dated: September 30, 2022



MICHAEL MILLEN, ESQ.  
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF

**JURY DEMAND**

Plaintiff hereby requests a jury trial in this matter.

Dated: September 30, 2022



---

MICHAEL MILLEN, ESQ.  
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF

**EXHIBIT “B”**



**ROB BONTA**  
**Attorney General**

**State of California**  
**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**



**Bureau of Criminal Information and Analysis**  
Record Review and Challenge Section  
P.O.Box 160207  
Sacramento, CA 94203-4170

7/2/2021

**REDACTED**

Re: California Criminal History Information  
CII # **REDACTED**

Dear **REDACTED**

This correspondence is in response to your written communication dated 6/25/2021, regarding your claim of alleged inaccuracy or incompleteness in your California state summary criminal history record as maintained by the California Department of Justice (DOJ).

Under California Penal Code Sections 11120-11126, the Record Review and Challenge Section assists individuals who would like to order a copy of their own California summary criminal history record, and dispute the material matter contained therein.

The DOJ is required, pursuant to California Penal Code section 11105(a)(2), to record specific arrest, disposition, and personal identification information when reported by a law enforcement agency or court of this state. Modification or deletion of this information can only occur at the direction of the contributing agency or by order of the court having jurisdiction over the criminal matter. As such, please be advised your claim of alleged inaccuracy or incompleteness is in process. Upon conclusion of the DOJ's findings, you will receive a written response.

If you have further questions or concerns regarding your record review, please direct your correspondence to the Record Review and Challenge Section at the address provided above.

Sincerely,

Record Review and Challenge Section  
Record Quality Services Program  
Bureau of Criminal Information and Analysis

For **ROB BONTA**  
Attorney General

## ATTACHMENT CV-5012

**CIVIL LAWSUIT NOTICE**

Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara  
191 North First St., San José, CA 95113

CASE NUMBER: 22CV405055

|                                     |
|-------------------------------------|
| <b>PLEASE READ THIS ENTIRE FORM</b> |
|-------------------------------------|

**PLAINTIFF** (the person suing): Within 60 days after filing the lawsuit, you must serve each Defendant with the *Complaint*, *Summons*, an *Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Information Sheet*, and a copy of this *Civil Lawsuit Notice*, and you must file written proof of such service.

**DEFENDANT** (The person sued): **You must do each of the following to protect your rights:**

1. You must file a **written response** to the *Complaint*, using the proper legal form or format, in the Clerk's Office of the Court, within **30 days** of the date you were served with the *Summons* and *Complaint*;
2. You must serve by mail a copy of your written response on the Plaintiff's attorney or on the Plaintiff if Plaintiff has no attorney (to "serve by mail" means to have an adult other than yourself mail a copy); and
3. You must attend the first Case Management Conference.

**Warning:** If you, as the Defendant, do not follow these instructions, you may automatically lose this case.

**RULES AND FORMS:** You must follow the California Rules of Court and the Superior Court of California, County of <\_CountyName\_> Local Civil Rules and use proper forms. You can obtain legal information, view the rules and receive forms, free of charge, from the Self-Help Center at 201 North First Street, San José (408-882-2900 x-2926).

- State Rules and Judicial Council Forms: [www.courtinfo.ca.gov/forms](http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/forms) and [www.courtinfo.ca.gov/rules](http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/rules)
- Local Rules and Forms: <http://www.sccsuperiorcourt.org/civil/rule1toc.htm>

**CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE (CMC):** You must meet with the other parties and discuss the case, in person or by telephone at least 30 calendar days before the CMC. You must also fill out, file and serve a *Case Management Statement* (Judicial Council form CM-110) at least 15 calendar days before the CMC.

**You or your attorney must appear at the CMC.** You may ask to appear by telephone – see Local Civil Rule 8.

Your Case Management Judge is: Kirwan, Peter Department: 19

The 1<sup>st</sup> CMC is scheduled for: (Completed by Clerk of Court)

Date: 02/28/2023 Time: 3:45 PM in Department: 19

The next CMC is scheduled for: (Completed by party if the 1<sup>st</sup> CMC was continued or has passed)

Date: Time: in Department:

**ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION (ADR):** If all parties have appeared and filed a completed *ADR Stipulation Form* (local form CV-5008) at least 15 days before the CMC, the Court will cancel the CMC and mail notice of an ADR Status Conference. Visit the Court's website at [www.sccsuperiorcourt.org/civil/ADR/](http://www.sccsuperiorcourt.org/civil/ADR/) or call the ADR Administrator (408-882-2100 x-2530) for a list of ADR providers and their qualifications, services, and fees.

**WARNING:** Sanctions may be imposed if you do not follow the California Rules of Court or the Local Rules of Court.